

REMARKS

The above amendment is made in response to Advisory Action mailed November 17, 2004 and the Final Office Action mailed September 2, 2004.

Claims 1-8 and 10 are pending in this application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 8, 9, and 10 have been cancelled. Claims 11-13 have been added. Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 7-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent 10-318933 to Tomoyoshi for the reasons stated on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

At the very minimum, claims 7 and 11 are believed to be patently distinct over Tomoyoshi. For example, Tomoyoshi does not disclose or suggest "*an array of luminous emitters disposed on a first surface of a sensor body for emitting incident rays,*" as essentially claimed in claim 7. Furthermore, Tomoyoshi does not disclose or suggest "*emitting rays from an array of luminous emitters,*" as essentially claimed in claim 11. Examiner relies on Tomoyoshi as disclosing a luminous source (31, 51). Although Tomoyoshi discloses a luminous source (31, 51), the luminous source (31, 51) is a Light Emitting Diode (LED). The LED of Tomoyoshi is not an array of luminous emitters in which each emitter emits ray that is to be received by a corresponding sensor on an array of photo detecting sensors. Thus, the LED of Tomoyoshi cannot provide accuracy

in determining positions of the wafer. Accordingly, Tomoyoshi does not anticipate claims 7 and 11. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomoyoshi for the reasons stated on pages 3-4 of the Office Action.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “*an array of luminous emitters disposed on a first surface of a sensor body for emitting incident rays.*” Examiner relied on Tomoyoshi as disclosing luminous emitters (31, 51). Applicant respectfully submits that Tomoyoshi does not teach or suggest “*an array of luminous emitters disposed on a first surface of a sensor body for emitting incident rays,*” for at least the same reasons given above for claims 7 and 11. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinguished and not rendered obvious by Tomoyoshi. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 3, 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on the allowable independent claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11-13, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889